

Topology Change in General Relativity*

GARY T. HOROWITZ

*Department of Physics
University of California
Santa Barbara CA 93106-9530
gary@voodoo.bitnet*

ABSTRACT: A review is given of recent work on topology changing solutions to the first order form of general relativity. These solutions have metrics which are smooth everywhere, invertible almost everywhere, and have bounded curvature. The importance of considering degenerate metrics is discussed, and the possibility that quantum effects can suppress topology change is briefly examined.

* To appear in the proceedings of the Sixth Marcel Grossman Meeting held in Kyoto, Japan, June 24-29, 1991.

1. Introduction

It has been over thirty years since Wheeler first suggested that the topology of space might change in a quantum theory of gravity[1]. However, this idea has still not been definitely established. The difficulty is simply that topology change does not seem to be allowed in classical general relativity, and we do not yet have a quantum theory of gravity which is sufficiently developed to permit reliable calculations of the amplitude for topology to change. Over the years this issue has been considered by a large number of people. (It has also been investigated in a variety of spacetime dimensions including two[2, three[3, four[4, five[5, and higher[6].)

What I would like to do today is reexamine the question of whether topology change can occur in classical (four dimensional) general relativity. We will see that by slightly extending our notion of what constitutes a solution to Einstein's equation, there *do* exist topology changing solutions. Furthermore, the extension we will need is strongly motivated by quantum ideas.

Let me begin by reviewing the standard arguments for why topology change cannot occur in general relativity. First, there is the well known result of Geroch[7: Consider any spacetime containing two spacelike surfaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ of different topology. (For simplicity I will assume $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ are compact, so these are closed universes, but most of the results generalize to open universes also.) Geroch showed in 1967 that independent of any field equations, this spacetime must have either closed timelike curves or singularities. There is a second result which appears to be less well known: If one does impose Einstein's equation or even just the weak energy condition, $T_{\mu\nu}l^\mu l^\nu > 0$ for all null l^μ , the situation is worse. Tipler showed in 1977 that generic topology changing spacetimes are singular[8. Thus, even allowing closed timelike curves, one cannot change topology without creating singularities.

Faced with these results, people have generally followed one of two paths. Some have given up the local energy condition and tried to make sense of the resulting negative energy and causality violation[9. However, most people have taken a second path, which is to give up on Lorentz metrics entirely and adopt Euclidean techniques to describe topology change[10, 11, 12, 13. I would like to follow a third path which is to keep Lorentz metrics *and* the field equations and ask what kind of singularities are required in order to change topology? The theorems show that if a metric satisfies Einstein's equation on a topology changing manifold, then it cannot be well defined everywhere. We will see that the points at which the metric is ill defined do not have to be strong curvature singularities. The singularities can be very mild. In fact, they can be so mild that in some sense they are not there at all!

To make this more precise, it is convenient to consider the first order form of general relativity. This can be described in terms of a collection of four (dual) vectors called the

tetrad e_μ^a and a Lorentz connection ω_μ^{ab} . The spacetime metric is recovered from the tetrad by $g_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu^a e_\nu^b \eta_{ab}$ where η_{ab} is the constant Minkowski metric. The action is

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int e^a \wedge e^b \wedge R^{cd} \epsilon_{abcd} \quad (1)$$

where $\wedge$ denotes the antisymmetric wedge product, $R = d\omega + \omega \wedge \omega$ is the curvature two form and ϵ_{abcd} is the constant antisymmetric tensor. The field equations take the form

$$e^b \wedge R^{cd} \epsilon_{abcd} = 0 \quad (2)$$

$$e^{[a} \wedge D e^{b]} = 0 \quad (3)$$

where $D = d + \omega$ is the covariant curl. Even though these equations may look unfamiliar, I want to emphasize that this is not an exotic new theory of gravity. When e_μ^a is invertible i.e. the tetrad consists of four linearly independent one forms, the action (1) is completely equivalent to the usual Einstein-Hilbert action and the equations of motion are equivalent to the vacuum field equation. Eq. (2b) says that the connection is torsion free and (2a) says that the Ricci tensor vanishes. However this action also describes a slight extension of general relativity. Notice that the inverse of the tetrad never appears. So the action and field equations remain well defined even when e_μ^a is degenerate. Thus the first order theory (1) naturally includes degenerate metrics.

2. The Importance of Degenerate Metrics

It is conventional in general relativity to restrict consideration to metrics which are invertible everywhere. However since general relativity is presumably just the low energy limit of a quantum theory of gravity one should be able to derive this restriction from the quantum theory. It is difficult to see how this will come about. Consider the functional integral

$$\int D e D \omega e^{iS(e, \omega)} \quad (4)$$

One way in which degenerate metrics might be excluded is if they are infinitely far away from nondegenerate metrics in field space. However this is not the case^[14]. The natural measure on the space of tetrads is obtained from the norm

$$||\delta e||^2 = \int \delta e_\mu^a \delta e_\nu^b e^\mu_c e^\nu_d \eta_{ab} \eta^{cd} \det e d^4 x \quad (5)$$

Even though this norm involves the inverse tetrad e^μ_c , the volume element more than compensates for it. The norm (squared) is homogeneous of degree two in the tetrad, and thus vanishes as $e_\mu^a \rightarrow 0$ ensuring that $e_\mu^a = 0$ is a finite distance from invertible e_μ^a . If only one tetrad vector vanishes, the norm may diverge, but the distance is still finite. For

example, consider $e_\mu^1(s) = s e_\mu^1(0)$ and $e_\mu^a(s) = e_\mu^a(0)$ for $a \neq 1$. Then the norm squared is proportional to s^{-1} , the norm is proportional to $s^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, and the distance to $s = 0$ is finite.

Another way to exclude degenerate metrics is to simply restrict the functional integral (3) to invertible tetrads. However not only is this unjustified and unnatural, it is not even gauge invariant! There are gauge transformations which relate degenerate and nondegenerate metrics*. To see this, we begin with the change in the tetrad and connection under a diffeomorphism generated by a vector field ξ^μ :

$$\delta e_\mu^a = D_\mu \rho^a + 2\xi^\nu D_{[\nu} e_{\mu]}^a - \tau^a_b e_\mu^b \quad (6)$$

$$\delta \omega_\mu^{ab} = \xi^\nu R_{\nu\mu}^{ab} + D_\mu \tau^{ab} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\rho^a \equiv \xi^\mu e_\mu^a \quad (8)$$

$$\tau^{ab} \equiv \xi^\mu \omega_\mu^{ab} \quad (9)$$

Since the terms involving τ^{ab} are a standard tetrad rotation, we can consider a modified transformation consisting of a diffeomorphism and a compensating rotation. This simply removes the terms involving τ^{ab} from eqs. (5). Now consider the space of solutions to the field equations (2) with invertible metrics. Since one of the field equations implies that the torsion vanishes $D_{[\mu} e_{\nu]}^a = 0$, the modified transformation becomes

$$\delta e_\mu^a = D_\mu \rho^a \quad (10)$$

$$\delta \omega_\mu^{ab} = \rho^c (e_c^\nu R_{\nu\mu}^{ab}) \quad (11)$$

One often considers the gauge parameter to be a vector field ξ^μ which is independent of e_μ^a and ω_μ^{ab} . (ρ^a is then a derived quantity.) In this case it is indeed true that finite gauge transformations do not relate degenerate and nondegenerate metrics. But the gauge group is actually much larger than this. The action is clearly invariant under (5) in the more general case when ξ^μ does depend on e_μ^a and ω_μ^{ab} . These are field dependent diffeomorphisms[15]. One can thus adopt ρ^a as the gauge parameter. Now finite gauge transformations do relate degenerate and nondegenerate metrics. For example, if we start with a flat solution $R_{\mu\nu}^{ab} = 0$, then the transformation (7) reduces to $\delta \omega_\mu^{ab} = 0$, $\delta e_\mu^a = D_\mu \rho^a$. Choosing ρ^a to be independent of e_μ^a , this infinitesimal transformation is immediately integrated to yield $e_\mu^a(s) = e_\mu^a(0) + s D_\mu \rho^a$. For many choices of ρ^a , $e_\mu^a(s)$ is degenerate for some finite s^{**} . More generally, we will show in the next section that *every nondegenerate solution is gauge equivalent to one which is degenerate somewhere*.

* I wish to thank A. Ashtekar and J. Hartle for discussions on this point.

** Expressed in terms of ξ^μ , the vector field becomes large as the metric becomes degenerate. But this does not seem to be sufficient justification to rule it out. The important point is that the change in the fields (7) remains finite.

Having hopefully convinced you of the need to consider degenerate metrics[16 I can now state the main result[17: *there exist smooth (C^∞) solutions to general relativity in first order form, that describe topology change.* The tetrad e_μ^a becomes degenerate on a set of measure zero but the curvature remains bounded. (Since these topology changing solutions typically live on manifolds that do not admit any globally invertible Lorentz metric, they are not gauge equivalent to nondegenerate solutions. This shows that the converse of the above statement is false.) Thus by simply extending general relativity to allow degenerate metrics, one finds that topology change can occur classically. It is important to note that unlike the earlier Euclidean quantum gravity discussions in which topology change was viewed as a quantum tunneling phenomenon, the picture we obtain is of topology change as an essentially classical process.

I should perhaps clarify what I mean by degenerate metrics. It is well known that even for the flat Minkowski metric, one can choose coordinates such that the determinant of the metric vanishes at certain points. This is a result of the fact that the new coordinates are going bad at these points. They cannot be related to the original good coordinates by a smooth invertible transformation. This is not the sort of degeneracy which allows topology to change. Instead, one must fix a (topology changing) manifold with its collection of good coordinates first. A solution to Einstein's equation on this space is described by a Lorentz connection together with four dual vectors which are not linearly independent at certain points. This is independent of the particular choice of (good) coordinates one chooses to express them in.

3. Topology Changing Solutions

To obtain the topology changing solutions we proceed as follows. Let M be a manifold with topologically different boundaries $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$. Then one solution to the field equations is clearly $\omega_\mu^{ab} = 0$, $e_\mu^a = 0$ everywhere. To obtain a metric which is invertible almost everywhere, notice that with $\omega_\mu^{ab} = 0$, the field equations (2) are satisfied if $\partial_{[\mu} e_{\nu]}^a = 0$. So one can take any four smooth functions λ^a on M and set $e_\mu^a = \partial_\mu \lambda^a$. This clearly solves the field equations and for generic choices of λ^a , the metric will be invertible almost everywhere. To ensure that the induced metric on the boundaries is spacelike (again almost everywhere) one need only choose λ^0 to be constant on the boundaries. The resulting metric is flat. This can be seen either from the vanishing of the curvature two form, or by noticing that at points where e_μ^a is invertible, the metric $g_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \lambda^a \partial_\nu \lambda^b \eta_{ab}$ can be interpreted as a coordinate transformation of the constant flat metric.

One can also obtain nonflat solutions to the first order equations (2) on any topology changing manifold. To see this, let us first reformulate the method used to find the above solution more geometrically. Recall that given a smooth map from one manifold M to another $\tilde{M}$, one can “pull back” C^∞ covariant tensor fields on $\tilde{M}$ and obtain C^∞ fields on

M . To be explicit, if $x^\mu, \tilde{x}^\mu$ are local coordinates on $M, \tilde{M}$ respectively, and $\tilde{T}_\mu$ is a C^∞ one form on $\tilde{M}$, then under a smooth map $\tilde{x}^\mu(x^\alpha)$ its pull back to M is

$$T_\alpha = \tilde{T}_\mu \frac{\partial \tilde{x}^\mu}{\partial x^\alpha} \quad (12)$$

Note that this is well defined even if $\tilde{x}^\mu(x^\alpha)$ is not invertible. The four functions λ^a in the above solution define a smooth map from M to $\mathbf{R}^4$. The solution itself is simply the pull back via this smooth map of the standard flat Minkowski space solution on $\mathbf{R}^4$. Now consider any smooth, nonsingular, curved solution to Einstein's equation on $\mathbf{R}^4$. Let e_μ^a and ω_μ^{ab} be the associated tetrad and Lorentz connection. Pick any smooth map $\phi : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^4$. Then the pull back of these forms via the smooth map will again yield a smooth solution on M . Since the map from M to $\mathbf{R}^4$ is not a diffeomorphism, the pull back of e_μ^a can fail to be invertible even though the original e_μ^a was. There will be points where some of the one forms will vanish, and other points where all four one forms will be nonzero but linearly dependent. Generically, the metric will be degenerate only on a set of measure zero.

How does the curvature behave near these degenerate points? This is where one might expect this approach to break down. Since ω_μ^{ab} is smooth, the curvature two form is smooth everywhere. However curvature scalars require the inverse of e_μ^a and since e_μ^a is becoming degenerate, one might expect these scalars to diverge as one approaches the degenerate points. But this is not the case. The appropriate components of the curvature two form go to zero at precisely the points where the tetrad becomes degenerate so that the curvature scalars are all finite. To see this, note that at all points where e_μ^a is invertible, the curvature scalars on M are just the pull back of the corresponding scalars on $\mathbf{R}^4$. Since the solution on $\mathbf{R}^4$ is chosen to be nonsingular, the curvature scalars are all finite. So the curvature on M does not diverge as one approaches the degenerate points.

Now consider a solution on M which is obtained via pull back under a smooth map ϕ from an invertible solution on $\mathbf{R}^4$. Suppose we keep the solution on $\mathbf{R}^4$ fixed but change ϕ slightly. Then the solution on M will change. A straightforward calculation shows that the change in the solution is precisely of the form of the gauge transformation (7) (together with a tetrad rotation). The expression $e_c^\nu R_{\nu\mu}{}^{ab}$ remains well defined even when the metric degenerates, since it is the pull back of the corresponding expression on $\mathbf{R}^4$. The gauge parameter ρ^a is obtained as follows. In local coordinates, a one parameter family of smooth maps is given by a C^∞ function $\tilde{x}^\mu(x^\alpha, s)$. If we fix the point x^α of M and take the derivative with respect to s , we obtain a vector v^μ on $\mathbf{R}^4$ at the point $\tilde{x}^\mu(x^\alpha, s)$. As x^α changes, v^μ changes smoothly. The gauge parameter is $\rho^a = v^\mu e_\mu^a$ where e_μ^a is the tetrad on $\mathbf{R}^4$. (v^μ is *not* a vector field on $\mathbf{R}^4$ since it can take more than one value at the same point, but ρ^a is single valued on M .)

It is now easy to prove the claim made earlier that every nondegenerate solution to (2) is gauge equivalent to a degenerate solution under the gauge transformations (7). Given

an invertible solution on $\mathbf{R}^4$, consider a one parameter family of smooth maps $\phi(s)$ from $\mathbf{R}^4$ to itself such that $\phi(0)$ is a diffeomorphism and $\phi(1)$ is not*. Then the pull back of the solution via these maps yields a one parameter family of solutions which interpolate between a nondegenerate and degenerate metric. By the above remark, these are all gauge equivalent. It is important to keep in mind that although the topology changing solutions are also obtained by pull backs and are degenerate, they are qualitatively different: As we remarked earlier, since M typically does not admit any globally invertible Lorentz metric, the topology changing solutions are not gauge equivalent to nondegenerate solutions.

We have not yet considered boundary conditions. For all topology changing solutions we have discussed so far it turns out that the metric is degenerate somewhere on each boundary. (This is because the functions λ^a must achieve a maximum and minimum on each boundary, and at these points $\partial_\mu \lambda^a = 0$.) It is natural to ask whether there are topology changing solutions where the metric is invertible near each boundary. It might appear that the answer is no: For invertible metrics, the evolution equations of the first order theory are equivalent to the usual ones of general relativity, which guarantee a unique invertible evolution. So if one starts with invertible initial data, it might appear that the solution cannot become degenerate and the topology of space cannot change. This argument is wrong. There do exist topology changing solutions with invertible metrics near each boundary. To obtain them, we will use the same pull back construction. However, rather than mapping the boundary into $\mathbf{R}^3$, we will map it into a space which is topologically similar to it. This turns out to be a bit more delicate than the above case. To see the potential problem, we start with a two dimensional example.

Suppose one wants to find a Lorentz metric on the space describing one circle spitting into two which is flat everywhere and invertible near the boundaries (see fig. 1). One might try to pull back the flat metric on the cylinder via a smooth map that is the identity map on each boundary component (so the metric will be invertible). Unfortunately, no such map exists. There is a simple topological obstruction which is the conservation of winding number. If ϕ has winding number one around each circle in the future, it must have winding number two around the circle in the past. Fortunately, the pull back of a metric under a map with winding number two can still be invertible. The boundary will simply be twice as large. So one can obtain the desired metric by taking a smooth map which is the identity on each boundary in the future and a two fold cover in the past and pull back the flat metric on the cylinder.

For a special choice of the map ϕ the resulting spacetime looks like fig. 2. This is the familiar example of two dimensional Minkowski spacetime identified under certain translations. Both vectors in the dyad vanish at P , but they are smooth everywhere. For more general choices of ϕ , the metric will be degenerate on a circle.

* This argument generalizes easily from solutions on $\mathbf{R}^4$ to other manifolds.

We can now extend this construction to four dimensions. Recall that given any space $\mathcal{S}$ with a noncontractible loop, we can obtain a new space $\mathcal{S}_n$ by, roughly speaking, unwrapping this loop n times. This is called the n -fold covering space. The projection back to the original space is called the covering map. This map is the higher dimensional analog of a map with winding number different from one. It is locally a diffeomorphism, so if a metric on $\mathcal{S}$ is invertible, its pull back to $\mathcal{S}_n$ will be also. We start with a solution to Einstein's equation on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathbf{R}$. We would like to proceed as follows. First choose a four dimensional manifold M with boundary components $\mathcal{S}_n$ and $\mathcal{S}_m$ in the future and $\mathcal{S}_p$ in the past. Then choose a smooth map from M to $\mathcal{S} \times \mathbf{R}$ which reduces to the covering map on the boundary and pull back this solution. The question is: Does such a map exist? Fortunately, this question has been extensively studied by differential topologists [18, 19, 20]. They have shown that if $p \neq n+m$ then no smooth map exists. (This is the higher dimensional analog of conservation of winding number.) However, if $p = m + n$, then there always exists a manifold M with the required boundaries such that the map does exist.

The net result of this construction is a class of solutions describing a compact universe which bifurcates into two, or two compact universes which coalesce into one. For each solution the two components are locally identical, but globally different. I should emphasize that this is just one construction and probably does not exhaust the class of topology changing solutions to the first order theory with invertible metrics near the boundary. In particular, it is likely that there exist solutions describing bifurcating universes which are not locally identical in the future.

Although we have been working in the context of the first order form of general relativity, it should be clear from the construction that this is not essential. One can certainly replace the connection ω_μ^{ab} with its self-dual part in the action (1) and still obtain topology changing solutions. (The resulting action yields Ashtekar's new variables for canonical quantization [22].) One can also work directly with the standard second order form of general relativity, and pull back the covariant metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. The result is a Lorentz metric on a topology changing manifold M , which is invertible almost everywhere and satisfies Einstein's equation (in the usual sense) where ever it is invertible. Since $g_{\mu\nu}$ is smooth, it seems reasonable to define it to be a solution everywhere. Using this same approach, one can clearly include matter fields as well (at least those described by covariant tensors).

We now consider several examples. This construction does not yield bifurcating universes with S^3 topology. Since a sphere is simply connected it has no covering spaces. However there exist nontrivial examples with toroidal boundaries. Consider a smooth solution on $T^3 \times \mathbf{R}$. Since all (finite) covering spaces of T^3 are again topologically T^3 , we can now obtain a solution on a manifold with a T^3 boundary in the past and two disjoint T^3 boundaries in the future (see fig. 3). Note that when the boundary are tori, the winding number around each S^1 is not separately conserved. Only the total number of times the torus covers itself matters. As a second example let $\mathcal{S}$ be the three dimensional

analog of a genus two surface. In other words it is a three-sphere with two handles added (each topologically $S^2 \times \mathbf{R}$). The covering spaces $\mathcal{S}_n$ are now spheres with $n + 1$ handles. Then starting with a solution on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathbf{R}$ a large number of topology changing solutions can be constructed. The simplest example is shown in fig. 4, which is obtained by choosing ϕ to be a two-fold cover in the past and the identity map in the future. Although one cannot obtain solutions with more than two spherical boundaries this way, one can obtain wormhole solutions (fig. 5). One can also obtain solutions with no boundary in the past (fig. 6). This is because the integers m and n can be negative as well as positive. (A negative integer just means that one unwraps the space in the other direction. More precisely, the projection map from $\mathcal{S}_m$ to $\mathcal{S}$ reverses orientation rather than preserving it.) So one can find a solution with boundaries $\mathcal{S}_m$ and $\mathcal{S}_{-m}$ in the future. If there is more than one noncontractible curve in $\mathcal{S}$, these spaces can be topologically different. This spacetime might be interpreted as “pair creation of universes from nothing”. (It should be contrasted with the unique conception theorem of Gibbons and Hartle in the context of invertible Euclidean metrics[23].) I should emphasize that in all these cases, the metric is Lorentzian everywhere except a set of measure zero where it is degenerate.

4. Why is Topology Change Suppressed?

It is clear from these classical solutions that the problem of topology change has been turned around. The question is not whether topology change can occur, but rather how do we stop topology from changing? Why doesn't the space around us suddenly split into disconnected pieces? As a first step toward resolving this embarrassing discrepancy between theory and experiment, let us look more closely at the implications of these topology changing solutions for quantum gravity. We are used to the fact that if something occurs classically, it must occur quantum mechanically with some probability, otherwise there is a conflict with the correspondence principle. Unfortunately, this argument does not apply here. The reason is that it assumes unique evolution from initial data. When the metric becomes degenerate, this fails. (This also explains why there exist topology changing metrics which are invertible initially.) To see this, recall that we have constructed solutions which change topology from $\mathcal{S}_{m+n}$ to $\mathcal{S}_m \cup \mathcal{S}_n$. Since the integers can be negative as well as positive, one can consider the case where $n = 1 - m$. Now the initial surface is identical to $\mathcal{S}$ (see fig. 7). This shows that there are at least two ways to evolve initial data on $\mathcal{S}$: one in which the topology does not change and another in which it does. I want to emphasize that both solutions are smooth everywhere. Since for all initial data there is a classical evolution without topology change, there is no obvious inconsistency with forbidding topology changing processes in the Lorentzian functional integral for quantum gravity (3).

There is a possibility that the argument for topology change can be made much

stronger. Suppose one starts with initial data on $\mathcal{S}$ and tries to avoid topology change. Then one obtains a solution on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathbf{R}$. However the singularity theorems[24] show that generically, this solution will be geodesically incomplete. This is usually interpreted as evidence for unbounded curvature resulting from cosmological singularities. But in some cases, the geodesic incompleteness is just a sign that the metric is becoming degenerate. It can still have a smooth extension in the first order formalism.

For example, consider the metric

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + t^2 dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 \quad (13)$$

where x, y, z are identified with $x + 1, y + 1, z + 1$ respectively so that the manifold is topologically $T^3 \times \mathbf{R}$. This spacetime is flat and so trivially solves the vacuum field equation. It can be obtained by taking the product of a flat two torus with a Lorentzian cone, i.e. the quotient of the interior of the light cone in two dimensional Minkowski space by a Lorentz boost. The surface $t = -1$ is a compact Cauchy surface with the unit normals converging everywhere. By an early singularity theorem[25], the spacetime must be geodesically incomplete. Indeed, the metric is not invertible at the vertex of the cone, $t = 0$, and so this must be removed in standard general relativity. However the metric is clearly smooth for all $-\infty < t < \infty$. In first order form, the spacetime is described by $e^0 = dt$, $e^1 = tdx$, $e^2 = dy$, and $e^3 = dz$. The connection can be found by solving the equation for the vanishing of the torsion. The only nonzero component is $\omega^{01} = dx$. This is clearly a smooth solution to the first order equations for all $-\infty < t < \infty$.

In this example, the topology of space does not change when the metric becomes degenerate. But there may exist more subtle examples in which one can extend the metric smoothly and solve the field equation only by changing the spatial topology. If so, one can view this as a genuine prediction of topology change in general relativity.

One mechanism for suppressing topology change has been proposed by Anderson and DeWitt[26]. They considered the behavior of quantum fields in topology changing backgrounds. In particular, they investigated a scalar field propagating in the two dimensional geometry of fig. 2 and found that the topology change resulted in an infinite amount of particle creation. Further analysis[27, 28] has confirmed this conclusion. The basic reason behind this result is the fact that a typical scalar field becomes discontinuous as it propagates past the degenerate point. Since the stress tensor is quadratic in derivatives of the field, it picks up a term proportional to the square of a delta function which leads to an infinite expected energy. Since we now have a more general class of topology changing solutions, we can ask whether this is always the case. The answer is no*. Let us stay in two spacetime dimensions for simplicity. Then we can construct solutions with winding number n and m in the future and $n + m$ in the past. If m and n are both positive, then it turns out that typical scalar field solutions will again become discontinuous. However, if

* This work was done in collaboration with A. Steif.

$n = 1 - m$, this is no longer the case. On these topology changing spacetimes, *all smooth initial data for a scalar field has a smooth evolution for all time!* To show this, consider any C^∞ initial data on the circle. First evolve this data on the cylinder to obtain a smooth solution. Now pull back this solution to obtain a smooth solution on the topology changing spacetime. Since the map on the initial circle is the identity, the initial data is unchanged. So the problem that caused infinite particle production disappears. Notice that this argument is not time reversal invariant. Given arbitrary smooth initial data on S_m and S_{1-m} in the future, there does not always exist a smooth evolution into the past. This indicates that topology change may be a time asymmetric process (see also ref. [27]) and could be a mechanism for introducing time asymmetry into quantum gravity.

Unfortunately, the existence of smooth evolution for all initial data does not guarantee that quantum fields are well behaved on these topology changing backgrounds. One problem is that the evolution is not unique*. This was also a problem in considering quantum fields on the topology changing manifold shown in fig. 2. In that case, since the field was becoming discontinuous, it was not clear what it meant for the field to satisfy its field equation at the degenerate point. One could essentially add an arbitrary source at that point. Requiring that the inner product was conserved reduced, but did not completely eliminate, this freedom in evolution. However, it was shown that the expected energy diverged for any evolution which conserved the inner product. For the manifold with $n = 1 - m$ (fig. 7) the situation is different. Even requiring that solutions be smooth everywhere, there are inequivalent evolutions from given initial data. (This is related to the fact that the metric in fig. 7 is degenerate on the surface γ which is not contractible to a point.) Since the field is smooth everywhere and satisfies its field equation (in the usual sense) almost everywhere, the inner product will be conserved for all evolutions. Unfortunately, for any choice of evolution, it turns out that a complete basis of functions in the past does not evolve into a complete basis of functions in the future. This complicates the usual calculation of particle creation. It is not yet clear what the effects of this are for the quantum theory. It is currently under investigation[29].

To conclude, we have shown that general relativity in first order form has topology changing classical solutions. These solutions have metrics which are smooth everywhere, invertible almost everywhere (including a neighborhood of each boundary), and have bounded curvature. Previous arguments for infinite particle creation do not apply to some of these solutions. It is still possible that quantum effects will suppress topology change. If not, and if we assume it is undesirable or even inconsistent to explicitly forbid topology change, we are left with a basic question: What is the “cosmic glue” that inhibits the universe from splitting?

* This is related to, but not equivalent to, the lack of unique evolution we discussed earlier. Before we considered different spacetimes evolving from the same initial data. Here we are fixing the spacetime and considering different evolutions of a test field in this background.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank the organizers of the Sixth Marcel Grossman Meeting for the invitation to lecture. I have benefited from discussions with A. Ashtekar, D. Eardley, S. Giddings, J. Hartle, T. Jacobson, G. Mess, J. Polchinski, M. Scharleman, and A. Strominger. This work was supported in part by NSF Grant PHY-9008502.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 The construction for obtaining a flat Lorentz metric on the space describing one circle splitting into two.

Fig. 2 The solution, for a special choice of ϕ .

Fig. 3 The construction for obtaining a solution describing one torus splitting into two.

Fig. 4 More complicated solutions can also be obtained.

Fig. 5 A wormhole solution.

Fig. 6 A solution describing the “pair creation of universes”.

Fig. 7 Initial data on $\mathcal{S}$ does not have unique evolution. The metric is degenerate on the surface γ .

References

1. J. Wheeler, *Ann. Phys.* **2**, 604 (1957); in *Relativity, Groups, and Topology*, eds. B. DeWitt and C. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1964).
2. J. Polchinski, *Nucl. Phys.* **B324**, 123 (1989); D. Gross and A. Migdal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 127 (1990); *Nucl. Phys.* **B340**, 333 (1990); M. Douglas and S. Shenker, *Nucl. Phys.* **B335**, 635 (1990); E. Brezin and V. Kazakov, *Phys. Lett.* **B236**, 144 (1990); S. Harris and T. Dray, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **7**, 149 (1990).
3. E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B323**, 113 (1989); S. Carlip and S. de Alwis, *Nucl. Phys.* **B337**, 681 (1990); Y. Fujiwara, S. Higuchi, A. Hosoya, T. Mishima, and M. Siino, “Topology Changes in 2+1 Dimensional Quantum Gravity”, TIT preprint TIT/HEP-170/COSMO-9 (1991).
4. In addition to the references provided below, see e.g. W. Kundt, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **4**, 143 (1967); D. Brill, in *Magic Without Magic*, ed J. Klauder (W. H. Freeman,

- 1972); P. Yodzis, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **26**, 39 (1972); *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **4**, 299 (1973); and R. Gowdy, *J. Math. Phys.* **18**, 1798 (1977).
5. E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B195**, 481 (1982).
 6. F. Tipler, *Phys. Lett.* **B165**, 67 (1985); P. Mazur, *Nucl. Phys.* **B294**, 525 (1987).
 7. R. Geroch, *J. Math. Phys.* **8**, 782 (1967).
 8. F. Tipler, *Ann. Phys.* **108**, 1 (1977).
 9. R. Sorkin, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 978 (1986).
 10. S. Hawking, *Nucl. Phys.* **B144**, 349 (1978); *Phys. Lett.* **B195**, 337 (1987) .
 11. S. Coleman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B307**, 864 (1988).
 12. S. Giddings and A. Strominger, *Nucl. Phys.* **B306**, 890 (1988); *Nucl. Phys.* **B307**, 854 (1988).
 13. D. Garfinkle and A. Strominger, *Phys. Lett.* **B256**, 146 (1991).
 14. S. Giddings, “Spontaneous Breakdown of Diffeomorphism Invariance”, preprint UCSBTH-91-23, *Phys. Lett. B* to appear.
 15. For a discussion of field dependent diffeomorphisms, see J. Lee and R. Wald, *J. Math. Phys.* **31**, 725 (1990).
 16. For further discussion of degenerate metrics see e.g. A. Tseytlin, *J. Phys. A* **15**, L105 (1982); E. Witten, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **117**, 353 (1988); *Nucl. Phys.* **B311**, 46 (1988); R. Percacci, *Nucl. Phys.* **B353**, 271 (1991); R. Floreanini, R. Percacci, and E. Spallucci, “Why is the Metric Nondegenerate?”, preprint SISSA 132/90/EP; and I. Bengtsson, “Degenerate Metrics and an Empty Black Hole”, preprint 90-46 ITP Goteborg, Sweden.
 17. G. Horowitz, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, 587 (1991).
 18. C. Gibson, *Singular Points of Smooth Mappings* (Pitman, London, 1979).
 19. M. Hirsh, *Differential Topology* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976).
 20. P. Conner and E. Floyd, *Differentiable Periodic Maps* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1964).
 21. J. Samuel, *Pramana* **28**, L429 (1987); T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, *Phys. Lett.* **B196**, 39 (1987).
 22. A. Ashtekar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 2244 (1986); *Phys. Rev. D* **36**, 1587 (1987); C. Rovelli, “Ashtekar formulation of general relativity and loop space non-perturbative quantum gravity: a report” University of Pittsburgh preprint (1991), to appear in

- Class. Quantum Grav.; A. Ashtekar, *Lectures on Nonperturbative Canonical Gravity*, (notes prepared in collaboration with R.S. Tate) World Scientific, 1991.
- 23. G. Gibbons and J. Hartle, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 2458 (1990).
 - 24. S. Hawking and R. Penrose, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond.* **A314**, 529 (1970).
 - 25. S. Hawking, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond.* **A300**, 187 (1967).
 - 26. A. Anderson and B. DeWitt, *Found. Phys.* **16**, 91 (1986).
 - 27. C. Manogue, E. Copeland, and T. Dray, *Pramana J. Phys.* **30**, 279 (1988).
 - 28. R. Sorkin, “Consequences of spacetime topology”, to appear in the proceedings of the Third Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics, Victoria (1989).
 - 29. G. Horowitz and A. Steif, in progress.